REMARKS

Claims 1–44 were previously pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 24–26, 32 and 37 are amended. Claims 4, 10, 12–23, 27–31, 33–36 and 38–44 are canceled.

Claims 1–3, 5–9, 11, 24–26, 32 and 37 remain pending.

35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1–30 and 35–44

Claims 1–30 and 35–44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0225502 by Bear, et al. (hereinafter "Bear"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Bear discloses a record button on a computer system. The record button facilitates audiovisual input into the computer system without requiring manual interaction with software. The record button can be actuated with different actuation techniques which correspond to difference audio and/or video operating modes, which can be configured by a user. A record light is provided to notify the user of a current recording mode via variable colors and/or flash patterns.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites one or more computer-readable media having executable instructions stored thereon. When the instructions are executed, several method steps are executed. The steps include: (1) "providing a set of modes for interacting with a computing device, at least some of the modes selectable by a user of the computing device, the modes being associated with settings of the computing device, the computing device interacting with the user in a first mode;" (2) detecting a change in light incident to a display of the computing device;" (3) "determining at least one of the settings to change in response to the change in light

incident to the display of the computing device;" and (4) "changing the at least one of the settings to cause the computing device to interact with the user in a second mode."

Claim 1 describes a computing device that is reactive to a change in light that is incident upon the device. The computing device operates in a first mode until the device detects a change in light that is incident to a display of the computing device. When such a change is detected, the computing device operates in a second mode.

It is noted that the previous version of claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations recited in the previous claim 4, now canceled. In the rejection of previous claim 4, the Office Action cites page 6, paragraph 67 of Bear as disclosing or anticipating the elements of claim 1. Applicant disagrees.

That particular excerpt of Bear describes a "record light", such as an LED, that is used to notify a user of a current action or current recording mode. The record light changes in response to the device mode.

Applicant asserts at least two issues with the excerpt in regard to claim 1. First, the "light" recited in claim 1 is light that falls on the computing device. The "record light" of the reference is an electrical device. Second, the light in the reference is responsive to the device mode, whereas claim 1 describes just the opposite, to-wit: the mode of the computing device changes in response to a change in light that is incident upon the computing device.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 and 5-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claim 9, which previously depended from claim 1, has been amended to be an independent claim. Claim 9 recites one or more computer-readable media having executable instructions stored thereon that, when executed, implement a method that

includes steps of: (1) detecting a change in ambient noise surrounding a computing device;" and (2) "changing a volume setting to cause the computing device to change a speaker volume from a first volume level to a second volume level in response to the change in ambient noise."

Bear does not disclose or anticipate step (2) recited above. The Office Action states that paragraph 67 of Bear discloses this element of claim 9. Applicant disagrees. This paragraph describes detecting ambient noise in a device environment. However, the only response made by the device to a change in the ambient noise is that the device stops recording audio when it detects an absence of ambient noise (see also, Bear, paragraph 63).

Claim 9 requires not only that a change in ambient noise be detected, but that in response to that change, causing a speaker volume to change from one level to another. For example, if the device detects more ambient noise, the device may be configured to turn up the volume so a user can better hear audio from the device. This is not disclosed or anticipated by Bear.

Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 depends from claim 9 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of claim 11 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 24 has been amended to recite one or more computer-readable media that includes executable instructions stored thereon. When said instructions are executed, the following steps are implemented: (1) "providing a plurality of computing device features to a user;" (2) "detecting when an anxiety level of the user has increased;" and (3) "simplifying the plurality of features provided to the user in response to the increased level of user anxiety."

Bear does not disclose or anticipate the elements recited in claim 24. It is noted that the amendments to claim 24 have incorporated previous limitations that were included in claim 31, which was not rejected under § 102, but under § 103. In that rejection, the Office admitted that Bear does not disclose detecting an increased level of user anxiety.

Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claims 25, 26 and 32 depend from claim 24 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claim 37 has been amended to recited a "system for interacting with a user." The system comprises: "a keyboard configured to enter data into the system, said keyboard including a plurality of keys;" "one or more sensors configured to detect that the user has difficultly in pressing multiple keys simultaneously;" and "an engine configured to query the user regarding whether the user wants to enable sticky keys." If the user expresses an interest in using sticky keys, the engine is configured to enable a sticky keys feature.

A "sticky keys" feature causes a <Ctrl> or <Alt> key to effectively remain depressed until the next key is pressed. In other words, if a user cannot physically hold down a combination of keys, certain keys are configured to remain logically depressed until a subsequent key is actuated. For example, a <Ctrl>-<Alt>-<Del> key combination is commonly utilized. Using sticky keys, a user can press these keys individually in sequence to effect the same result.

Bear does not disclose or anticipate the steps of claim 37. Specifically, Bear does not disclose detecting when a user has difficulty pressing multiple keys simultaneously or providing a response to such detection. Paragraph 38 of Bear merely discloses different types of input devices, including a keyboard. Although the Office states that

Type of Response: Non-Final Response
Application Number: 10/715,765
Attorney Docket Number: 304557.01
Filing Date: 11/18/2003

9/12

"keyboard problems are inherently detected when using multi-interface devices such as a keyboard," Applicant contends that keyboards do not inherently detect problems associated with a user having difficulty pressing keys. What may be inherent in keyboards is that users have problems pressing keys, but this is not the same as "detecting" such problems. Furthermore, Bear simply does not describe the concept of sticky keys.

Accordingly, claim 37 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 10, 12-23, 27-30, 35, 36 and 38-44 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 31-34

Claims 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Bear in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,647,834 issued to Ron. **Claims 31, 33 and 34** have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 32.

Claim 32 has been amended to depend from claim 24, which has been shown to be allowable over Bear, above, at least by virtue of that dependency. Claim 32 includes a limitation that "the anxiety level is detected via a galvanic skin response strip."

Neither Bear nor Ron discloses this particular element. The excerpts from Ron cited as disclosing this element merely describe detecting a user's altered emotional state by analyzing the user's speech patterns. There is no mention of any physical device used to detect a heightened level of anxiety in a user, much less a galvanized strip.

Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over Bear and Ron and the rejection of claim 32 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: __January 20, 2006__

By: _____

James R. Banowsky, Reg. No.: 37,773
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 705-3539
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

Type of Response: Non-Final Response
Application Number: 10/715,765
Attorney Docket Number: 304557.01
Filing Date: 11/18/2003